



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,116	11/14/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008206-1	6990

7590 01/27/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,116

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed 14 November 2001.
2. Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1, 12, and 23 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 6-8, 17-19, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claims 6-8, 17-19, and 28-30 recite the limitation "the first client computer" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The applicant discloses a client computer, but fails to disclose "the first client computer" referred to in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-10, 12-21, and 23-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardailler (Textual Equivalents, 1998) in further view of Raz (US

Art Unit: 2178

6292827, 2001) and Abbott et al. (US 2002/0087525, publish 2002, application 2001, hereafter Abbott).

As per independent claim 1, Dardailier discloses a destination service which obtains portions of text in the information (pages 3-4, Image OCR: Here, Dardailier discloses obtaining the text in an image through an OCR method). Dardailier further discloses a browser (page 1, paragraph 1). Dardailier fails to disclose:

- A client computer coupled to a network
- A server computer coupled to a network
- Information associated with a client computer
- Storing information associated with a user of the client computer

Raz discloses the system for identifying and extracting text in a distributed processing environment, comprising:

- A client computer coupled to a network (column 1, lines 39-51)
- A server computer coupled to a network (column 1, lines 39-51)
- Information associated with a client computer (column 2, lines 5-10)

Abbott further discloses storing information associated with a user (paragraph 0051: Here, a user profile is used to store information about a user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Dardailier's system comprising a browser and obtaining text information with Raz's system comprising coupling a client and server to a network, and further with Abbott's system comprising storing a user profile, since it would have allowed a user to store information about his/her preferences in a

Art Unit: 2178

networked system while maintaining the ability to browse the information and obtain text data from the profile at a later time.

As per dependent claim 2, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dardailler further discloses the method wherein the text is extracted from the information using optical character recognition (pages 3-4, Image OCR).

As per dependent claim 3, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dardailler further discloses the system wherein the text is represented by a text rendition of an internal representation of an indicated region of the text (pages 3-4, Image OCR: Here an image containing text that can be detected is a text rendition of an internal representation of an indicated region of text).

As per dependent claim 4, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dardailler further discloses the system wherein the information associated with the user of the client computer is graphical information that includes textual information (pages 3-4, Image OCR: Here, an image contains textual information).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott's system for storing information associated with a user with Dardailler's system for storing information about a user as graphical information that includes textual information, since it would have allowed a user to store the information associated with a user in a non-proprietary

Art Unit: 2178

format so that the information can be transported from one client computer to another client computer.

As per dependent claim 5, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dardailler further discloses the system wherein the graphical information is identified using a uniform resource locator (URL) (pages 1-3, multiple cases to consider: Here, multiple options for using a URL to disclose an image on a network are disclosed).

As per dependent claim 6, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Abbott further discloses the system wherein the information is specific to a user of a client computer (paragraph 0051: Here, a user profile, specific to a user, is stored).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott's system for extracting text in a distributed environment with Abbott's system wherein the information is specific to a user, since it would have allowed a user to store information associated with a user in a non-proprietary format so that the information can be transported from one client computer to another client computer.

As per dependent claim 7, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Abbott further discloses the system wherein the information resides on the client computer (paragraph 0020).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott's system for extracting text in a distributed environment with Abbott's system wherein the information resides on the client computer, since it would have allowed a user to access information specific to the user without downloading the data from the network.

As per dependent claim 8, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Raz further discloses the system wherein the information resides remote from the client computer (column 2, lines 39-51: Here, the database system stores the information remote from the client).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott's system for extracting text in a distributed environment with Raz's system storing information remote from a client computer, since it would have allowed a user to work at a client computer with limited resources such as memory.

As per dependent claim 9, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dardailler further discloses the system wherein the destination services uses a code portion in the browser to obtain the portions of text in the information (pages 1-6: Here, the browser takes the HTML as input and attempts to come up with text for images and other HTML elements through the use of techniques including: Image Comments, Image Pattern, Image OCR, Server Side Image Map Loop, and others disclosed on pages 1-6).

As per dependent claim 10, Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dardailler further discloses the system wherein the destination service uses the server to directly access and obtain portions of text in the information (page 4, Server Side Image Map Loop: Here, a server emulates clicks in order to obtain documents which can then be sorted to obtain text information).

As per independent claim 12, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 1. Claim 12 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 13, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 2. Claim 13 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 14, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 3. Claim 14 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 15, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 4. Claim 15 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 16, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 5. Claim 16 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 17, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 6. Claim 17 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 18, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 7. Claim 18 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 19, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 8. Claim 19 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

Art Unit: 2178

As per dependent claim 20, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 9. Claim 20 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 21, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 10. Claim 21 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per independent claim 23, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 1. Claim 23 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 24, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 2. Claim 24 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 25, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 3. Claim 25 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 26, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 4. Claim 26 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 27, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 5. Claim 27 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 28, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 6. Claim 28 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott.

Art Unit: 2178

As per dependent claim 29, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 7. Claim 29 is thusly rejected under Dardailier, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 30, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 8. Claim 30 is thusly rejected under Dardailier, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 9. Claim 31 is thusly rejected under Dardailier, Raz, and Abbott.

As per dependent claim 32, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 10. Claim 32 is thusly rejected under Dardailier, Raz, and Abbott.

8. Claims 11, 22, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dardailier, Raz, and Abbott in further view of Quass et al. (US 2002/0083068, print 2002, application 2001, provisional 2000, hereafter Quass).

As per dependent claim 11, Dardailier, Raz, and Abbott disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dardailier, Raz, and Abbott fail to specifically disclose the system wherein portions of text in the information are used to complete a web page form. However, Quass discloses the system wherein portions of text in the information are used to complete a web page form (paragraph 0029).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Dardailler, Raz, and Abbott's system for identifying and extracting text with Quass's system for completing web forms, since it would have allowed a user to automatically visit pages hidden behind forms (Quass: paragraph 0029).

As per dependent claim 22, the applicant discloses the method for execution on the system of claim 11. Claim 22 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, Abbott, and Quass.

As per dependent claim 33, the applicant discloses the computer readable medium having a program for execution on the system of claim 11. Claim 33 is thusly rejected under Dardailler, Raz, Abbott, and Quass.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Janakiraman et al. (US 2002/0124025): Discloses scanning and outputting textual information in web page images.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).


Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

KRS

 1/21/65
CESAR B PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2178